



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/350,952	07/09/1999	LAURENCE R. BROTHERS	99-803	8993

32127 7590 10/12/2004

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3H14
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CUONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3661

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/350,952

Applicant(s)

BROTHERS, LAURENCE R. 51

Examiner

CUONG H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-33 and 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-33 and 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3625

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Non-Final Office Action is the answer to the "Response to Office Action" received on 2/25/2004, which paper has been placed of record.

2. Claims 20-33, 35-43 are pending in this application.

Response:

3. Because of searching the 2 different groups of claims (representing 2 abstract inventions - a virtual document/computer program (claims 1-19), and a method of providing virtual catalog (claims 33, 35-43) were a serious burden to examiner due to different classifications and different subject matters, and because Mr. James Weixel orally elected claims 20-33, and 35-43 for continuing examination on 11/04/2003 after the examiner's explanations; those elected claims are examined as below.

The rejection of claim 42 is withdrawn for 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd para., rejection from the clarification from applicant's response on 2/25/2004.

The examiner respectfully submits that Perkowski's system serve consumer product-related information over the Internet (see Perkowski, the abstract).

Applicant argues that the rejection does not modify the main reference or assert that it would work with any type of

Art Unit: 3625

data. The rejection follows the *Graham v. Deere* inquiries by determining the scope and content of the prior art, determining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue and resolving the difference in light of the level of ordinary skill in the art. While the particular data claimed is not identical to that in the reference, it would have been recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art that any difference does not create a functional distinction between the claimed method and the teaching of the claimed reference. In other words, those of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized, in light of the applied prior art, that the data used does not alter how the recited steps are performed. As a result, since the steps of the method and those of the prior art are effectively the same, there is no patentable distinction.

These arguments must involve an explanation of **how the data was being used in the claim, or how to verify content; the claimed limitations of "responding to requests for verification of the content based on the sourcing information and the information for verifying content; and "responding to selection of objects for at least one of sale by and purchase by a user in accordance with the at least one ordering method information and payment method information."** do not contribute to a method of providing a catalog because "verifiable" is not significantly

Art Unit: 3625

contribute to claimed steps of providing a catalog; as best interpretation in claim 20, there are only 2 essential steps: providing information and verifying content in a method of providing an electronic catalog.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. Independent claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

These claimed "responding" steps simply meaning something to the human mind; they do not require any technological art involvement (claiming a "computer-based method" in a preamble does not require all steps in the body must use technological art; it is not ENOUGH - i.e., limitations of "responding to requests for verification of the content based on the sourcing information and the information for verifying content; and

responding to selection of objects for at least one of sale by and purchase by a user in accordance with the at least one ordering method information and payment method information").

The United States Constitution under Art. I, §8, cl. 8 gave Congress the power to "[p]romote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries". In carrying out this power, Congress authorized

Art Unit: 3625

under 35 U.S.C. §101 a grant of a patent to "[w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition or matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof." Therefore, a fundamental premise is that a patent is a statutorily created vehicle for Congress to confer an exclusive right to the inventors for "inventions" that promote the progress of "science and the useful arts". The phrase "technological arts" has been created and used by the courts to offer another view of the term "useful arts" See *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ (BNA) 280 (CCPA 1970). Hence, the first test of whether an invention is eligible for a patent is to determine if the invention is within the "technological arts". Further, despite the express language of §101, several judicially created exceptions have been established to exclude certain subject matter as being patentable subject matter covered by §101. These exceptions include "laws of nature", "natural phenomena", and "abstract ideas". See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450, U.S. 175, 185, 209 USPQ (BNA) 1, 7 (1981). However, courts have found that even if an invention incorporates abstract ideas, such as mathematical algorithms, the invention may nevertheless be statutory subject matter if the invention as a whole produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result." See *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v.*

Art Unit: 3625

Signature Financial Group, Inc. 149 F.3d 1368, 1973, 47 USPQ2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

This "two prong" test was evident when the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) decided an appeal from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI}. See *In re Toma*, 197 USPQ (BNA) 852 (CCPA 1978). In *Toma*, the court held that the recited mathematical algorithm did not render the claim as a whole non statutory using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test as applied to *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 175 USPQ (BNA) 673 (1972). Additionally, the court decided separately on the issue of the "technological arts". The court developed a "technological arts" analysis:

The "technological" or "useful" arts inquiry must focus on whether the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the product of the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the prior art which the claimed subject matter purports to replace...is statutory, and not on whether the claimed subject matter is presently perceived to be an improvement over the prior art, e.g., whether it "enhances" the operation of a machine. *In re Toma* at 857.

In *Toma*, the claimed invention was a computer program for translating a source human language (e.g., Russian) into a target human language (e.g., English). The court found that the claimed computer implemented process was within the

Art Unit: 3625

"technological art" because the claimed invention was an operation being performed by a computer within a computer.

The decision in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.* never addressed this **prong of** the test. In *State Street Bank & Trust Co.*, the court found that the "mathematical exception" using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test has little, if any, application to determining the presence of statutory subject matter but rather, statutory subject matter should be based on whether the operation produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result". See *State Street Bank & Trust Co. at* 1374. Furthermore, the court found that there was no "business method exception" since the court decisions that purported to create such exceptions were based on novelty or lack of enablement issues and not on statutory grounds. Therefore, the court held that "[w]hether the patent's claims are too broad to be patentable is not to be judged under §101, but rather under §§102, 103 and 112." See *State Street Bank & Trust Co. at* 1377. Both of these analysis goes towards whether the claimed invention is non-statutory because of the

Application/Control Number: 09/852,497 Page 5 Art Unit: 3622

presence of an abstract idea. Indeed, State Street abolished the Freeman-Walter-Abele test used in *Toma*. However, State Street

Art Unit: 3625

never addressed the second part of the analysis, i.e., the "technological arts" test established in *Toma* because the invention in *State Street* (i.e., a computerized system for determining the year-end income, expense, and capital gain or loss for the portfolio) was already determined to be within the technological arts under the *Toma* test. This dichotomy has been recently acknowledged by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) in affirming a §101 rejection finding the claimed invention to be non-statutory. See *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d (BNA) 1669 (BdPatApp&Int 2001).

In the present application, there is no use of technology in the above claims. While the independent claim 20 has been amended to include the phrase " a computer-based method" in the preamble, not all the claimed steps indicate that electronically providing a catalog nor that it is electronically performing the actions. In order to place the claims within statutory subject matter, it is suggested that the Applicant amends claim 20 to more clearly define which steps are being performed by technology, such as computer processors, electronic communication networks, etc. Similar amendments could be made to the other steps in the claims in order to place them within statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 3625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 20-23, 26, 28, 30, 32, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat. 6,038,601), in view of Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), and in view of Dana Mackenzie.**

A. As per independent claim 20: Lambert et al. suggest about providing information over the Internet, validating a collection of data/(verification of contents), and providing notification to a client (see Lambert et al., the abstract).

Lambert et al. teach about providing a verifiable e-catalog/(responding to a user's selection) (see Lambert et al., 9:13-18).

Perkowski applies Lambert's idea in e-commerce; he teaches an environment of e-commerce, wherein product ordering and/or payment method information, and an offer to sell entry and/or an offer to buy entry are discussed, an environment of e-commerce,

Art Unit: 3625

wherein product ordering or payment method information, and an offer to sell entry or an offer to buy entry are discussed; in summary Perkowski provides related information (see **Perkowski**, 10:53 to 11:33).

Perkowski also suggests of providing information; however, what content in that specific information (for different intents of use which are not a limitation of a step of providing information) are belongs to non-function descriptive materials that do not contribute to claimed limitations of providing information steps. Although Perkowski does not expressly disclose of where to provide data in a catalog as claimed:

- providing sourcing information, and a payment method information in a header section;
- providing an entry in a body section of an electronic document, wherein that entry is corresponding to a sale from an above source; (the examiner submits that such entry is normally available/provided from an online source);
- providing information to verifying a document content in that document's footer section;
- Perkowski interactively performs communications (i.e., responding to requests for content verification, and responding to a user's selection).

Art Unit: 3625

- Both Lambert et al., and Perkowski do not define different structural portions in a catalog.

However, Mackenzie sufficiently teaches about providing tags for different portions of an electronic catalog in a computer environment; i.e., defining tags for different inputs depending on header, body, or a footer sections, (see Mackenzie pg.2: 3-7 and 18-20).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to appreciate a combination of Lambert et al., Perkowski, and Mackenzie for providing standard portions of an electronic document, and verifying a document's content as claimed for a benefit of helping a user to make sure that the viewing catalog is the updated, and authenticated document.

B. Re. To claim 41: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

Perkowski does not disclose about generating a tag in an electronic catalog for specifying a transaction type.

However, Mackenzie teaches about generating a tag in an electronic catalog (see Mackenzie page 1, para. 7-8, page 2, para.1-4) for specifying a transaction type.

C. Re. claim 21: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

Mackenzie further teaches about distributing elements of a document on www (see **Mackenzie** 2:27-30).

D. Re. claim 22: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 21 are incorporated.

Perkowski also teach that the distribution of an electronic document is via URL links (see **Perkowski**, the abstract).

E. Re. claim 23: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

Perkowski also teaches that an electronic document permits a user to select between URL links (see **Perkowski**, Fig. 4A1 - a user entering an Internet's address), and in-line data for presentation of multimedia content (see **Perkowski**, the abstract).

The examiner also submits that this claimed limitation is very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because for an accessible document, a user could make a selection among given choices for displaying (e.g., typing an URL or selecting a link for displaying a selection).

F. Re. claims 26, 28, 30, 32:

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

Perkowski teaches about providing integrating/assembling/aggregating elements (from different catalogs) into one

Art Unit: 3625

document/catalog (see **Perkowski**, 10:53-65).

About claim 32's limitation, the examiner submits that disassembling (e.g., cutting a document into 2 parts and renaming them) step is fundamental and analogous from **Perkowski's** teachings.

6. **Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat. 6,038,601), Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), in view of Dana Mackenzie, and further in view of Schumacher et al. (US Pat. 6,269,446).**

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

A. As to claim 24:

Perkowski and **Mackenzie** do not disclose about providing a digital signature in a footer of an electronic catalog.

However, **Schumacher** teaches a method of providing a digital signature in the footer of an electronic catalog, wherein a digital signature in the footer of said catalog is located (see **Schumacher**, the summary, and Fig.4).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to appreciate a combination of **Lambert et al.**, **Perkowski**, **Mackenzie**, and **Schumacher** for providing a digital signature in a footer of an electronic document for a benefit of using digital signature would be an indication that the viewing

Art Unit: 3625

catalog is the most authenticated, updated document.

B. Re. To claim 25: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 24 are incorporated.

Lambert et al., Perkowski and Mackenzie do not disclose about a digital signature comprises a private key that corresponds to a public key.

However, Schumacher further teaches an electronic document, wherein a digital signature comprises a private key that corresponds to a public key.

The examiner further submits that this limitation is fundamental (already been defined in dictionaries) to one of ordinary skill in the art because digital signature would utilized both pair of keys: public & private key (e.g., see Schumacher et al., the abstract) in verification/authentication.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to appreciate a combination of Lambert et al., Perkowski, Mackenzie, and Schumacher for providing a digital signature comprising a private key that corresponds to a public key, because artisan would recognized that a digital signature would comprise a pair of key that corresponding to each other for verification/authentication.

7. Claims 27, 29, 31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat. 6,038,601),

Art Unit: 3625

Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), in view of Dana Mackenzie, in view of Schumacher et al. (US Pat. 6,269,446).

8. The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

Schumacher further teaches a method for:

- locate a digital signature in the footer of said catalog (see Schumacher, the summary, and Fig.4). The examiner submits that this is obvious to a step of using that digital signature provided by the source for verification in claim 24.
- verifying for authentication/(security checking) of an electronic document/catalog, it would be analogous to repeat the same step for an integrated/assembled/aggregated catalog in claims 27/29/31 (see Schumacher, the abstract).

About claim 33's limitation, the examiner submits that verifying the authenticity for a disassembled catalog (e.g., cutting a document into 2 parts, renaming, and verifying them) is analogous from the combination of Perkowski and Schumacher's teachings.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to appreciate a combination of over Lambert et al., Perkowski, Mackenzie, and Schumacher ideas for verifying authentication with a digital signature because it gives a level

Art Unit: 3625

of authentication to a document; furthermore, it was old and well-know to use a digital signature for authentication of an electronic document.

8. Re. To claims 35-37: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat. 6,038,601), Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), in view of Dana Mackenzie.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

A. As to claim 35, Mackenzie also teaches about updating a catalog usin XML from old HTML (e.g., modifying an electronic catalog document), comprising:

- determine catalog's information is current; and
- update/modifying said electronic catalog (see Dana Mackenzie's pg.1) - e.g., portions of a HTML document are replaced with XML.

The examiner submits that this claimed limitations are very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because for reviewing a catalog, (the "determine catalog's information is current" limitation is assumed coming out with a "TRUE" answer because next step "updating a catalog" MUST be performed to incorporate that limitation) - (for instant, an Office Action at USPTO is created by Microsoft Word with identified portions:

Art Unit: 3625

Serial Number of an application (in a header), a body (detail actions), or in a footer (e.g., for page number)). Then merely determine whether document info. are current or not by just reviewing/looking at that document creation date, if not current, updating with current info. This has been routinely done by a computer user; these limitations are old and well-known.

The examiner submits that one with ordinary skill in the art would appreciate a combination of Perkowski, Mackenzie, Mike Heck for verifying authentication/(e.g., security checks) because it has been a common practice of one with ordinary skill in the art to make sure an electronic catalog containing current information.

B. As to claim 36, this claim is also directed to a method for updating a document using time-stamps.

The examiner submits that computer programs are well-known for sorting elements by dates/time (those are stamped using a corrected machine clock), and could be programmed to delete old items by comparing to a given date (e.g., the most recent date and time). This claim contains limitations that is old and well-known to computer programmers.

C. As to claim 37: This claim is also directed to a method for updating a document, wherein the document has an indication for

Art Unit: 3625

modified or unmodified.

The examiner submits that a time-stamp for a document (knowing that detail by using a file directory) is old and well-known with computer users as an indication about a date/time for a modified/saving or an unmodified document; because artisans merely need to looking at when a file was saved giving an idea about it was modified or not.

9. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat. 6,038,601), in view of Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), in view of Dana Mackenzie, and further in view of Mital (US Pat. 5,953,652).

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

Mackenzie teaches about updating a catalog (e.g., modifying an electronic catalog document with XML instead of HTML).

Perkowski, and Mackenzie do not disclose about signing a catalog after updating.

However, Mital clearly teach why a digital signature must be used after updating a document (see Mital, 2:36-38).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to appreciate a combination of Lambert et al., Perkowski, Mackenzie, and Mital for verifying authentication using a signature software because it increases security levels

of an electronic document, and users would know for sure that a viewing catalog is the current updated version.

10. Re. To claim 39: It is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat. 6,038,601), in view of Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), in view of Dana Mackenzie, and further in view of Business Wire's article about Diamond Head.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

Mackenzie further teaches a method for annotation of an electronic catalog, comprising:

- generating a source document from elements/sections of an electronic catalog (by putting elements of a document together, a programmer could easily create a document) (see Mackenzie 1:26-31);
- provide an annotation section referring to entries in said source document (see Mackenzie 1:42-44).
- Perkowski, and Mackenzie do not disclose about a compound document.

However, Business Wire's article about Diamond Head teaches about that missing feature.

- Diamond Head teaches about "generate a compound document"

Art Unit: 3625

having elements similar to that of an electronic catalog (see Business Wire, page 2, para. 7); (the examiner notes that "compound document" has been known prior to application's priority date - e.g. in Object-Linking and Embedding (OLE) documents, then putting together elements to make a compound document);

It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine **Mackenzie**, and **Business Wire**'s article for generating a compound document from defined portions because this gives flexibility and convenience in handling different source elements in order to make an integrated document such as a compound document.

11. Re. To claim 40: It is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat. 6,038,601), in view of Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), in view of Dana Mackenzie, and further in view of Schumacher et al. (US Pat. 6,269,446).

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 39 are incorporated.

Perkowski and Mackenzie do not disclose about providing a digital signature for verification of a compound document.

However, Schumacher et al. teach about providing a digital signature for verification a document, and providing an

authentication of the source document, (see **Schumacher**, the summary, and Fig.4). The examiner submits that it is analogous to verifying an electronic document/a compound document because similar functions are performed on an object (it is not necessary that object must be a compound document).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to appreciate a combination of Lambert et al., Perkowski, Mackenzie, and Schumacher for providing a digital signature in a compound document because that digital signature is used for the only purpose of verification.

12. Re. To claims 42-43: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103 as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US Pat.

6,038,601), in view of Perkowski (US Pat. 5,950,173), in view of Dana Mackenzie, and further in view of the Official Notice.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 41 are incorporated.

A. As to claim 42: It is directed to a method, wherein a tag supports a one-to-one sales model.

The Official Notice is taken here that "a tag support a one-to-one sales model" is old and well-known in whole businesses (e.g., a manufacturer sells to a wholesaler a merchandise having a wholesale price tag).

B. As to claim 43: It is directed to a method wherein a sales

Art Unit: 3625

model tag supports one-to-one, many-to-one, and one-to-many sales model.

It is obvious that a user can use many different sales model (e.g., one-to-one, many-to-one, one-to-many) with a same-price sales tag in retailed business or wholesale, or buying items from many sources).

Conclusion

13. Claims 20-33, 35-43 are not patentable.

14. These prior art are related to applicant's subject matter:

- Mike Heck's article "Organize files on your Internet or intranet server for distribution" - (Mustang Software FileCenter 1.0)- teaches about building a catalog with header, body, and footer portions in an electronic document.

- Darlene **Fichter** discloses "Templating is the separation of content from the common page elements, such as the top logo or header area, side menu, and footer area of the page. With templating, you have the ease of frames on your site without any of the negative side effects. Consider the CNN [http://www.cnn.com] Web site shown here. The page layout has five main areas:

1. top or header area of the page

Art Unit: 3625

2. left-hand topical menus that remain consistent within a particular area on the site, the news story or headlines in the center block of the screen
3. the content or articles are in the middle column
4. the "related stuff" to the content is stored on the right column
5. a footer area that spans the bottom of the page

Each area could be stored separately and dynamically merged into one HTML page at the time the user requests it. This works much like a mail merge in your word-processing package. For example, all of the Web pages within the CNN Space area could reference and reuse the same Space header file. As the Web designer, you could update the header graphic and text for Space header file and voila--the thousands of pages immediately use the revised header file and display the new design.

Dynamically templating saves a lot of time, especially in redesigns. It also allows authors to focus on content while ignoring all the other page elements, which will be taken care of by the Webmaster.

Server Side Includes (SSI) and Active Server Pages (ASP) are two of the easiest ways of adding dynamic templating into your site. Almost every Web server supports either SSI or ASP.

Art Unit: 3625

SSI is commonly used on UNIX-based Web servers while ASP is used on Windows platforms.

SERVER SIDE INCLUDES

SSIs are simple and powerful. They get the templating job done, but offer none of the high-end processing of some of the sophisticated solutions discussed later in this article.

You create an SSI by inserting special HTML tags into the Web page in places where you would like the header, footer, and any other page elements to appear. Whenever a user requests a page from the server, the page is created on-the-fly by merging two or more files.

SSI statements look like html comments. They begin with [less than]!--# and end with-[greater than]. In the SSI example box, the Web page, home.html, would be created from the files header.html, home.html, and footer.html. The header file could contain a site logo, the side menu, and the body tag and link to an external style sheet. The footer could contain copyright statement, feedback button, and a link to the home page.

When a visitor's browser requests home.html, the Web server responds by merging the contents of the header and footer files into home.html and rendering the HTML for viewing in the browser. If every page on the Web site used the same SSI to

include the logo and side menu, then you could edit just one header file, which updates the whole site.

Example 1 also shows how Server Side Includes can be used to insert content into your Web page based on variables. (see "SSI in home.html" box.) In this case, the current date is inserted into home.html. This is commonly used to add "Last Updated" to the end of your html pages."

- PR Newswire, July 13, 1998, article title "DOCUMENTUM Launches EDMS 98 - Major New Release of Enterprise Document Management System Automates" teaches about compound document manipulations.

- PR Newswire, Dec 21, 1999, article titled « ESPS Introduces Document Management System (DMS) Object Toolkit; Enables Integration Between ESPS' CoreDossier(R) Software and Custom DMS Products or Commercial DMS Products Not Yet Supported by ESPS" teach about Publishing of DMS compound documents to CoreDossier directly from within the DMS client

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 703-305-4553. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 am - 330 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, JEFFREY A. SMITH

Art Unit: 3625

can be reached on 703-308-3588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687/703-746-5572.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cuong H. Nguyen

CHN
CUONG H. NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625